

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present invention. Claims 1-21 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 20, and 21 are independent claims. Claims 1 and 2 are amended. Claims 10-24 are new claims.

Scope of claims not changed

Applicants wish to note that the amendments to independent claim 1 are meant strictly to clarify the scope and substance of the claim, and are not meant to narrow or broaden the scope of the claim. The amendments to independent claim 1 are meant only to correct grammatical and stylistic issues.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1, 3, 4, and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Yunsk "Nessus Analysis Report", July 2001 (hereafter "Yunsk"). Insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 1 pertains, in part, to a script control unit that retrieves scripts from a script accumulation unit, creates a list of input / output parameters and a test procedure, presents a list of scripts to a user, and "[executes] a script that is selected by the user." Independent claim 1 also pertains, in part, to a plugin control unit that is called during script execution to execute a plugin on a test target computer.

Yunsk teaches the installation and some basic operational features of the Nessus computer security testing system. Yunsk discloses that Nessus is a client-server system that uses plugins to test for security holes and that the plugins are selected and executed through the Nessus client graphical user interface (GUI).

The Office Action asserts that the Nessus client structure allows the user to select and execute a script and therefore fulfills the function of the script control unit of independent claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Yunsk teaches that “the security test of Nessus is done through the plug-in item.” The selection and execution of plugins in the Nessus system takes place using the client GUI, which is only disclosed as providing the ability to select plugins. Yunsk also teaches that users may select a port scanner and an IP address range for scanning with the client GUI. All of these features are shown as having separate application tabs with buttons and editable text fields. Yunsk does not disclose any explicit scripting, script management, or script execution capability in the Nessus client GUI.

Independent claim 1 recites both scripts and plugins, and scripts are recited such that plugins are executed through a script that is selected by the user from a list of scripts. Yunsk only teaches the selection and execution of plugins from a list of plugins, and does not disclose similarly selecting a script or plurality of scripts that may in turn execute other scripts or plugins. Applicants respectfully submit that Yunsk does not teach or suggest the features of “presenting the list of the plurality of scripts to the user, and executing a script that is selected by the user” as required by independent claim 1.

With respect to claims 3, 4, and 8, Applicants submit that these claims should be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection with respect to independent claim 1 and all claims depending therefrom is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 2 and 5-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yunsk in view of Kim “About Firewall & Network Security Chap 10” (hereafter “Kim”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that the deficiencies in the teaching of Yunsk with respect to independent claim 1 are incorporated by reference into all claims depending therefrom. Applicants therefore submit that claims 2 and 5-7 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

New Claims

Applicants respectfully submit that new independent claims 20 and 21 are patentable for at least the same reasons given for independent claim 1.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that claims are allowable.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Michael K. Mutter, Reg. No. 29,680 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: **December 12, 2007**

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael K. Mutter

Registration No.: 29,680

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant